DIGITAL TEXT: INTERACTIVITY AND INTERTEXTUALITY

Vladimir Cerić

MA – PHD student of Faculty of Dramatic Arts, Belgrade – Serbia
ceric@viser.edu.rs

ABSTRACT

This paper is about theorization and analyses of digital text – through examples of digital texts such as film, television and Internet – with a special focus on constitutivity of features such as interactivity and hypertextuality and their relations. The aim of this paper is to point out place and function of these features and changing structure, which are resulted by media innovation, which is emergence of digital film and television. With its synchronic and diachronic introduction, this paper explains historical development of hypertextuality and interactivity, also with explanation of digital text's expansion, which is adjusted by type of digital narrative with its comparative introduction on development of digital forms of specified media.

INTRODUCTION

It is the need of the individual to work in Baudrillard's simulacrum to accept and understands the messages which he/she receives and sends within *hypertextual life* which is supported by digital technology, intertextuality, pervading the need for omnipresent and interactivity within the different factors of society.

Through examples of digital text on (digital) film, (digital) television and Internet, this paper will show development of its distinctions: intertextuality; interactivity and hypertextuality; with critical approach to Barthes' authors which by exploiting possibilities comparing to linear text and narrative, can reinvent their own limits for using new technologies.

Compared to arts, literature or cinema, in which narrative has always been one of the strongest ground in proving the *artistic*, hypertextuality and interactivity for many art theorist represent the danger to art. New narrativity, not rounded or closed, makes recipient able to connect the events, with the help of earlier experiences and cognitive thinking, in manner that many narratologist never wanted to admit it was possible. This paper shows problems of digital text, for reader and author, which is the result of unwillingness for adjusting both parties to its new structure. Recipient of digital text of

today, can understand a certain text in many different ways; also, every new *reading* becomes a new version of the original text, thanks to shifting the positions within the text, or by changing the environment in which text is positioned.

Many different theories which were written focusing only on one medium, will be pervade trough all elected media, because, their common is *digital*, a connecting element which provides round-up, in detail, intertextual *reading* and understanding. It is of a great importance to highlight that digital television and its interactivity asks for liberal interpretation of theories that were originally made for other media, since the interactivity and intertextuality were never part of serious and large-scale studies by theorist or scholars.

If we choose not to speak about *text* in its main signification, than *digital text* is connected to painting thanks to photography, to cinema with digital film, to television thanks to digital video or television.

Many changes that *digital* brought to us, quietly came to our dailiness, some of these changes are hidden (digital visual effects), some are natural (interactivity), other seem to be exciting and endless (hypertextuality and interactivity). Digital visual effects on film and television, for example, make reality substituted for fiction made in a computer, aiming towards reality, if needed, more real and more beautiful than it really is.

Digital text is historically rooted to printed or written text. Its most obvious use today is on Internet, but it can be found on autonomous multimedia presentations or digital gadgets of different types.

Intertextuality in digital text has more influence on Internet than any other place, because of its different multimedia agents. Also, intertextuality on the Internet is indissolubly connected to hypertext, generically made (using algorithms from previous searches by users), or created, by connecting different types of texts that have in common: the user, that can be the author (depending of the situation), and the data base (sorted by kind, popularity or experience of other users). This shift enables multi-linear, non-linear, non-sequenced or multi-sequenced reading of a text, which can bring to different types of reception. Hypertext, as non-linear reading, opens the problem of narrativity within the meta-text, and a concern of media scholars for reception of these types of text for *inexperienced* recipients or for text's artistic value. In case of Internet, intertextuality is extroverted: open for different types of text, to different media; in television or film it is mostly introverted and even referring to other texts it is closed in

medium which disables its openness. Intertextuality on television and film is referring to historical facts, other media and often - popular culture.

Lev Manovich in *The Language of New Media* describes interactivity in digital media as a way to externalize mental processes by using interface, for example, computer mouse. Interactivity is mostly a possibility of choice by selecting one of more options which influences further development or progress. It can be partial, if provides two options, or complete which needs many options and reaction of system (database). In this paper, based on certain type of movies, interactivity will be also defined in way that does not ask for participation by choosing options, yet greater integration of the recipient inside of medium by thinking and observing.

Designing content for digital environment asks from author to know the structure of media, and there are two approaches: designing by media or designing by content.

According to Marie-Laure Ryan most important feature of digital systems and media are: "Interactive and reactive nature: the computer's ability to take in voluntary or involuntary user input and to adjust its behavior accordingly. Volatile signs and variable display: what enables bits in memory to change value, causing pixels on the screen to change color. This property explains the unparalleled fluidity of digital images. Multiple sensory and semiotic channels: what makes the computer pass as the synthesis of all other media. Networking capabilities: the possibility to connect computers across space, bringing their users together in virtual environments" (Omon, Bergala, Mari, & Verne, 2006, pp. 291–302).

This framework will be starting point for analyzing all digital texts in this paper.

INTERACTIVITY

There are different interpretations of interactivity. For Marie-Laure Ryan in computer program which gives the user chance to go further or abort everything, OK or Cancel, we speak about partial interactivity, for full interactivity we need the *third button* or menu with many more options. For George Landow *third button* and system's reaction are mandatory factors of interactivity. It is important to point out that digital text does not have to be interactive when is placed in interactive environment – interactivity needs the option of choice.

It is hard to detach hypertextuality from interactivity. If the movement within the text is by linking one-to-one two way, hypertextuality is more apparent, but not enough to be labeled as a complete interactivity.

HYPERTEXTUALITY

Hypertext for Landow "denotes an information medium that links verbal and non-verbal information" (Landow, 2006, p. 3).

Hypertext, as a join form of different fragmented parts of texts, sounds, and images, connected by links, makes possible parallel reading of that form on *liberate*, nonlinear way. This type of text enables reader to receive the information depending on authors will to give the opportunity for the reader to explore, or by author's prediction of the reader's will. Work of art, contrary to text, or hypertext, does not give the recipient space to interpret the work on its free will. Text gives the recipient the role of the author because it's meaning is carved during the interpretation (reading). One of the distinctiveness of hypertext is discontinuity that is achieved by sudden shifts inside the text. Landow says "like many others who write on hypertext and literary theory argue that we must abandon conceptual systems founded on ideas of center, margin, hierarchy, and linearity and replace them by ones of multi-linearity, nodes, links, and networks"(Landow, 2006, p. 1).

There is no only one way to read different types of hypertextual contents; every reading depends of medium, its structure, relation to recipient and (collective) authorship.

Today instead of *hypermedia* or *interactive multimedia* we use the term *text* which recipients understand based on its content: they can read, listen, watch and participate.

Today, Umberto Eco's *The Open Work* is often compared to hypertext, there are some similarities but also differences. Eco wrote the concept of the open work in 1962 based on literature and music, where its openness came trough various interpretation. Eco claimed that there is no rounded artistic expression, that every interpretation gives the new subjective view in recipient. Eco, in *The Open Work*, speaks about openness in more metaphorical way, while hypertext's openness comes from its technical nature. Parts of hypertext can be different types of text open or not. Openness of hypertext it's not only connected to openness of its signification. If not endless hypertext of the Internet, hypertext of digital fiction has many paths but only one or few endings. Common for both open work and hypertext is the possibilities for different interpretation of the same work/text. Eco's division to *open work* and *work in movement*, points to differences in

the sense of openness. He defines work in movement as close assembly of different works of art, which make easier to make parallel with todays term of hypertext.

INTERTEXTUALITY

Term intertextuality is based on human habit to tell the stories. Concept of intertextuality started within the concepts of Ferdinand de Saussure, but it was first time used by Julia Kristeva. Intertextuality was the term reserved only for literary text. Michael Riffaterre says that intertextuality is "the term which refers on function of readers mind". Eco says that: "is not true that work is created by author. Work creates work, text creates text, and all together talk to each other depending on intentions of their authors" (Omon et al., 2006, pp. 291–302). Not a single text is independent; it is always connected to other text. Riffaterre also says that intertextuality presents: "corpus of text which reader can connect with what he sees in front of himself". Gérard Genette called problem of textuality – transtextuality "with features that explicit or implicit connect two texts" (Omon et al., 2006, pp. 291–302). Inside transtextuality Gennete sees: Paratextuality (relation between text and outer context); Hypertextuality, today called hypotextuality relation between two look a like texts or styles; Meatextuality (relation between text and its comments); Architextuality (relation between text and its genre architext).

DIGITALNI FILM: INTERACITIVITY, HYPERTEXTUALITY, INTERTEXTUALITY

"Once live action footage is digitized (or directly recorded in a digital format), it loses its privileged indexical relationship to pro-filmic reality. The computer does not distinguish between an image obtained through the photographic lens, an image created in a paint program or an image synthesized in a 3-D graphics package, since they are made from the same material – pixels" (Manovitch, 2001, p. not numbered).

Besides the process of editing or deep focus, possibilities of digital film, because of its unclear difference in ontology of different types of footage, can be the possibility for making more complicated type of narrative structures. In this process, it is not about manipulating the viewer with film's reality, it is about constructing the new reality, which is like filmic, digital and virtual a surrogate, one and only reality.

These digital information represent strings of beats represented as a pixel on a computer monitor. These numerically achieved values are easy to change to receive, one or endless number of new generated images which by every new alteration makes the viewer further from the world where he/she lives. These new images can be visible or

invisible, they can be classified as visible or invisible digital visual effects, when we deal with a series of computer generate images.

In Spielberg movies about dinosaurs, degree of interactivity was getting higher during the years as the technology was getting better. The difference between optically recorded and computer-generated characters was successfully aiming towards invisible, by doing that it was emphasizing its own presence. Beside the fact that digital images were not made optically or mechanically, thanks to real or possible-real environment and copying the ideal image of dinosaurs from the imagined possible world, for viewers they all seem real.

Digital visual effects, also, make the logic of possible world the new reality, made under the prints of filmic reality of pre-digital era. By using digital visual effects, moviemakers tend to imitate the world we live in, or to reproduce the optical effects that are known to the average viewer. In this case it is simulacrum, because the digital is used as a cheaper substitute for optical reality. This new reality becomes the only reality, because of unclear ontological borders and visual distinctions among them. Today technology is capable to produce the effects more powerful than imitation of real world, or to make its better and more beautiful version, but that would lead us to simulacrum of simulation which is, as Baudrillard says, "based on cybernetic information, model or a game" (Bodrijar, 1991, p. 122). In its time, Baudrillard could not define all directions of these types of simulacrum, but is clear today that for them we still need new medium, so that new, advanced, virtual reality and possible worlds inside of it can be next step in development.

It is possible to connect terms interactivity and intertextuality for the cinema beginnings as well, although it were invented much later. *Cinema of attraction*, as Tom Gunning called it in his article *An Aesthetic of Astonishment: Early Film and the (In)Credulous Spectator* shows the spectators' shift from the photography towards the film. "…The shock of the film image comes from a sudden transformation while the hardly novel projected photograph gives way to the astonishing moment of movement. The audience's sense of shock comes less from a naive belief that they are threatened by an actual locomotive than from an unbelievable visual transformation occurring before their eyes, parallel to the greatest wonders of the magic theatre" (Buckland, 2009, p. 119).

Further developments in cinema, after emergence of digital cinema, and before that, emergence of digital visual effects, resembles the cinema of attraction. In the article by Angela Ndalianis, *The Frenzy of the Visible: Spectacle and Motion in the Era of the Digital*

Senses of Cinema, explains her experience watching Matrix as a "physical assault on senses" (Ndalianis, 2000, p. 1).

Thomas Elsaesser pointed out the inward interactivity of film, which calls the spectator to act and react, with no need to change the flow of the movie at the recipient's request. Elsaesser, this new trend in cinema development within different genres calls *the mind-game film*. In these mind-manipulative movies by Lars von Trier, David Lynch or Christopher Nolan there are two approaches: manipulate the audience, or the characters. The main character in mind-game film is usually in a specific mental state which is extreme, unstable and pathological (schizophrenia, paranoia or amnesia); Information about reality are hidden from the audience and character, which knowingly lead to wrong conclusions; There is now clear difference between real and imaginary world represented in the film, it can be hidden from character and/or audience; Characters could be results of imagination; Character could be condemned by society by believing in existence of imaginary character, plots and story emerging from his existence. As Elsaesser said in The Ming-Game Film article these features make very complex narrative structure, because of "single or multiple diegesis, unreliable narration and missing or unclaimed point-of-view shots, episodic or multi-stranded narratives, embedded or 'nested' (story-within-story/film-within-film) narratives, and frame-tales that reverse what is inside the frame"(Buckland, 2009, p. 19). All this brings the viewer to believe in movie less during the storyline, but in the same time fascinated by moving pictures trying to participate in the storyline. Disavowal of reality is not limited only to mind-game film, yet to its intertextual and hypertextual followers: Internet blogs or computer games. The rules set by the film in new environments become the framework for further discussions or games. These rules of imaginary world of mind-game films become the rules of real world of the meta-text. Hypertextual form, emerging from these movies represents the continuation of movie's idea. Inward interactivity, which does not involve an influence of a recipient in narrative by choosing different options, enables sensory event that makes hypertextuality - it provides the recipients' ability to choose or decide about reality they want to believe. Elsaesser in essay *The Mind-Game Film* identifies inward interactivity of film, not calling it that way, and by doing so he discontinues its claim earlier stated in *Studying Contemporary American Film* that movies are not interactive.

Interactivity of film is still locked inside the medium, but new media such as DVD or Blu-ray disks enable the interactivity that still needs to be discovered for the authors and the audience.

There are examples of movies that are in computer sense interactive, where the viewer needs to select further development (among few options). According to Elsaesser and Buckland these movies assume a role of computer games, and should meet these requirements: Repetition of narrative; Different forms of an adventure; Changeable time and space; Magical transformations and disguise; Instant rewards and punishments; Tempo; Interactivity. In the movie *I'm Your Man* from 1992 it was the first time that spectator could choose what he/she wants to view, with no influence on the storyline. The first Serbian interactive movie called *Über life*, filmed 2010, resembles first person shooter games. The spectator becomes the main character and is making its decisions that have influence on the storyline. There are more than 30 options for building the storyline, but only few lead to happy end. Other options lead to death of a hero, where title *Over* emerges from screen, which intertextually refers to computer games. This movie can be watched, or played, from 10 to 30 minutes, but for viewing all storylines it can be played for several hours.

Announcement of new film to today's audience is different than 30 years ago, and storyline is adjusted to several versions of a movie, festival, television, Blu-ray, Internet, but also it is made for Internet discussions, computer game or a theme park. This leads Hollywood to *transmedia storytelling*, which adjusts the text for further development and reading on different media.

Hypertext in computer sense does not exist in feature films yet. There are examples that by combining a film with a computer game, like in extroverted interactive movies, could be called hypertextual. Software such as *Korsakow* enables creation of collage digital videos, which interactivity by choosing link could resemble hypertext. There are two points of view of hypertextuality in feature films, yet not recognized by film studies or theorist.

Adrian Miles in article *Cinematic Paradigms for Hypertext* assumes the existence of „particular relation that may exist between the discursive domains of film and hypertext in terms of a possible affinity between the cinematic edit and the hypertextual link" (Miles, 1999).

Other view of hypertextuality came from blogosphere by Alissa Quart in its critic of *Happy Endings* (Quart, 2005). She describes the movies where characters were placed in different stories emerging to one as a *hypertext genre*. In computer sense this is not connected to interactivity and its possible hypertextuality, rather it is the way the storyline is presented. One of the main characteristics of hypertextuality is uncontrollable

dispersal, in these types of films; on the other hand, narratives are controllably united, which is the form of backward hypertextuality. These films, can be part od mind-game films, but their endings are not opened for different interpretations or intertextual sequels, so even the minimal interactivity if they ever had it, is lost at the end. Hyperlink film is only the new term for defining fragmented narrative structures, and its well known since first parallel editing.

Digital narrative

For defining the digital narrative it is important to map basic characteristic of a traditional narrative. "A narrative is a sign with a signifier (discourse) and a signified (story, mental image, semantic representation). The signifier can have many different semiotic manifestations. It can consist for instance of a verbal act of storytelling (diegetic narration), or of gestures and dialogue performed by actors (mimetic, or dramatic narration" (Ryan, 2001, p. 2). Main characteristics are roundness and closeness, with a firm structure based on a certain outcome. All these characteristics are in contrary to principles of hypertext that is unstructured, open and interactive.

Interactive narratology and digital narrative as its part have something in common: time, space, characters and events. Differences come in interactive environment. Marie-Laure Ryan thinks that the most important feature of these narratives is structure of choice, role of participant (reader, viewer, player) and combination of these parameters that keep basic features of narrative. When digital narrative has no control by the author it can be rend because of large-scale hypertextuality and interactivity. That is the reason we still have *safe fields* in interactive narratology which structure narrative on critical places.

It is hard to easily define digital narrative because of its existence on different media, because the media is usually with no real ontological background, as it can be completely fictional, generated and changeable. Digital narrative is constructed on the Internet by taking the information out of database, internally in recipient, while on television or film (except experimental) was constructed by traditional narrative with photorealistic digital visual effects or intertextual and hypertextual connection with other media, especially Internet.

Common narrative structure of film it is easy to understand, with clear cause and effect, with typical characters and clear ending. While there is, in this type of narrative, headroom for different interpretations, television is more determine for easy understanding and linearity. If it is assumed that too much of digital visual effects on a

film may (or will) be bad for a storyline, on television because of its simpler and harder structure there is a bigger space for freewill its use.

Laura Mulvey in her text *Visual Pleasures and Narrative Cinema* studies the passive role of the spectator and its voyeuristic desertedness. For her a spectacle represents retreat from narrative systems. Mulvey claims that a narrative is more important than a spectacle in Hollywood movies, and, in the same time sees many limitations in narrative for future film development. She believes that spectacle should be repress in its will to rule the film; spectacle is the view of something ordinary on a (new) special way for those who watch it. Contrariwise, Elsaesser and Buckland in make the opposition between the narrative and interactivity, making narrative coherent with a spectacle. They refer to Guy Debord and explain spectacle as "a society (modern capitalism) in which direct experiences are replaced with represented experiences" (Elsaesser, 2002, p. 167). For them, film is a spectacle based on a time-space distance, therefor interaction between film and spectator is minimal, interaction, and interactive media are similar to festivals and ceremonies, according to Barthes' text that are written, not those who are read. In television, contrary to film, hero is not the main part of narrative; it is build trough chemistry between truth being told, and dramatization which follows it.

Digital narrative on television has to have a narrator, regardless where story took place; he shares our trust with a control he has over a situation. He knows what is next, and he has a knowledge that he is sharing with the audience piece by piece. He is an immortal hero, who didn't get his status with spoiled tears or blood; he used his knowledge and facts to explain from a distance what we see on a television screen. Knowledge is his power to draw attention of spectators to a show.

On television, part of diegesis and mimesis in digital narrative of educational television programs takes our attention from a spectacle of new technologies to its main goal – to educate.

DIGITAL TELEVISION: INTERACTIVITY, HYPERTEXTUALITY, INTERTEXTUALITY

If some day digital television becomes hot medium that would be thanks to its approach to the individual. Digital television already has good quality picture and sound that exceeds comic books or telephone, as Marshall McLuhan described analogue television of his time. He anticipated that better (digital) television would not be the same medium, which is partially right because of its overlapping with Internet but we still share *same* term and *same* habits.

It is important to pay attention to the actual position of television viewers within new interactivity of television, for long time they were passive, and now television wants to make them active, or at least reactive. Danger is at both sides because broadcaster look at viewers as a mass, and mass is now group of poorly connected individuals.

Hypertext in television context could be about connecting or referring to other texts and media. But, it is actually intertextuality that can have the elements of introverted hypertext. Hypertext, closed in television enables interaction not between viewers and broadcaster, yet between different television units, this concept can be similar to intertextuality as Julia Kristeva sees it.

According to Marie-Laure Ryan, every image, shown on television could be hypertextual if we look at our own life as a linear chain of events where television gives us the chance to move to different time and space. Problem in this claim is the position of the viewer to the medium and hypertext. When second television channel was introduced to us, viewers stopped to be observers, they started to decide. This extroverted hypertextuality, by introducing even larger scale of channels and new technologies, make hypertextual networks bigger and wider.

New technology developed by DataArt, at the beginning of 2010 strongly influenced hypertextuality in television context. Integration, in technical sense on consumers' side, is between television set with digital receiver and remote control with few extra options. At the broadcaster side, technology units are software for speak recognition, reader of indexed database of BBC and using Flash technology, as user interface. This provides simultaneous surfing the Internet and watching television with up to date information, and further deeper linking, personalization and analysis.

Introverted hypertextuality of television is easiest to see on live television program. Narrative in this case is aiming towards linearity, but in any second it can be discontinued and non-linear, with an instant substitution from television center with some other recorded program. Also, hypertext is build when some program starts on one, and continues on other channel. "The tendency of many twentieth-century works to leave readers with little sense of closure-either because they do not learn of the "final" outcome of a particular narrative or because they leave the story before any outcome s66u1s-5hews us that as readers and writers we have long learned to live (and read) with more open-endedness than discussions of narrative form might lead us to expect" (Landow, 2006, p. 228). Director or journalist hides these interruptions, and its effect is similar to commercial brakes.

Four years ago CNN made first hologram live TV recording, placing two actors more than 1000 kilometers away in same space. At two locations where actors were recorded, and one where they were placed, may seem intertextual, but it is real and virtual environment, not citation, so what the viewers saw was (interactive) hypertext.

Television viewer, in new time of interactive digital television will be important individual who knows the real possibilities of different hypertextual media; truly interactive, intertextual and hypertextual systems, that all must be the future of television development.

INTERNET: INTERACTIVITY, HYPERTEXTUALITY AND INTERTEXTUALITY

Internet is made up from different media. Almost every web page of today has text, animation, video or sound recording and each of these media was made in different environments: text processor, drawing, recording, editing or computer animation software.

Internet can be a cold medium (when we speak in McLuhan's terms) because the user has to find everything he/she wants by himself/herself. Users created many contents of Internet that need other users to participate so the content can be *alive*. In the same time, Internet has inside many hot media derivate, well defined and rounded. Conclusion is that in McLuhan's terms Internet can be hot and cold media in the same time.

Inside the vast space of Internet, hypertextuality found great implementation (although there are more complex systems). Internet gave the opportunity to create hypertextual (or hypermedial) environment, intertextual contents adjusted to our needs, even to help the needs of others, because its user interface makes interaction with other users and computers *easy*, it is the best place for observe all problems of digital text. Internet pages try to be constructed in special manner that gives users easy access to follow the links, and not be misguided, thanks to well organized methods for returning to the first page (home button or back).

Interactivity on the Internet can be between one user and text (which is from *endless* database); between many users (and databases).

As Landow wrote in *Hypertext 3.0*, from ideas of microfilmed, easy to read information on memex by Vannevar Bush to Web in the '90s, the humans waited only for technology to build real hypertextual system. We waited for high-speed databases and high-speed telecommunication to make Bush' concept reality, but that was not all. We needed to

free ourselves during more than a decade, when that all was reality, from hegemonic rule of text on the Internet, and make users aware that they can listen and watch motion pictures, animations, and concerts in this truly hypertextual media. For Landow hypertext is still best used in textual forms, such as blogs, wikis where by exchanging the texts among large number of other users, new hypertextual space is created. For Landow computer hypertext is phenomenon of "fundamental intertextuality" (Landow, 2006, p. 55). This claim has its grounds in truly textual part inside the word *hypertext*, and basics of intertextuality. Intertextuality, if content of the Internet is analyzed, can embrace all media forms which Internet users can ask depending on their will. If we look at only one webpage, intertextuality is relation between page's content, users habits and organization of website made by programmer and designer, and in personalized websites – proactive user.

Text to hypertext has an unbreakable link. For Nelson, hypertext is the basic form of text, and linear textuality is his sub form. Ryan in her book *Narrative as virtual reality* claims that hypertext is sub form of linear text and its advanced version. For Landow, Roland Barthes division on written and reading texts represents the difference between printed text and hypertext (Landow, 2006). Bush and Nelson claimed that "greatest strengths of hypertext lies in its capacity of permitting users to find, create, and follow multiple conceptual structures in the same body of information. Essentially, they describe the technological means of achieving Derrida's concept of decentering" (Landow, 2006, p. 10).

Landow sees hypertextuality in linking strings and lexias. At the beginnings of World Wide Web development lexias had more words, they were larger than a page, which lead to disorientation during the reading, but thanks to development of Internet-literacy this practice was discontinued over the time. There are many ways of linking, for Landow there are: one way (lexia-lexia; string-lexia; string-string); two way (lexia-lexia), multiple (one to many or many to one – string-lexia, lexia-string, lexia-lexia).

However, World Wide Web, represents a "primitive version [of] hypertext" (Landow, 2006, p. 106) because its linking is mostly in the form one to many.

CONCLUSION

Digital text in three media manifestation: digital film, digital television and Internet, has the corpus of all known features that coexist independently from media and type of content which are transferred through media. Influence and usage of these features depends on medium itself, author, recipient, but most of all from our perspective and

expectation how one of these features described with one term of digital textuality can be adjusted to new practice it describes. Terms that were describing some of the features of non-digital text, found its use very easily in new hypermedia content of film, television or Internet. Contrariwise, tendency for using new terms for already known and unchanged practices from past demolish the attempts for defining interactivity and intertextuality on new digital media.

Wrong usage or duplicating the terms we are not making our language richer by adding more synonyms, by doing so we are diminish its preciseness. That is why we have to use other terms for explaining one term: inner or outer interactivity, extroverted and introverted hypertextuality etc. However, problems of understanding features of digital text are not only in wrong language use, rather than in their non-language misunderstanding and interpretation. In some cases, certain textual practices cannot be used in every media, and therefor need to be adjusted. These adjustments to media can wider the common practice of a certain feature, but on the other hand that can destroy its main feature in original media.

In this paper characteristics of digital film, digital television and Internet are mapped ontologically, textually and narratively, thanks to theories of Elsaesser, Landow, Ryan, Manovich and McLuhan. Thanks to even older theories of text, written many decades before emergence of digital, it seems that they were waiting to gain their full meaning with the help of new technology, and make new step into the future.

REFERENCES

Bodrijar, Ž. (1991). *Simulakrumi i simulacija*. (F. Filipović, Trans.). Novi Sad: Svetovi.

Buckland, W. (2009). *Puzzle Films: Complex Storytelling in Contemporary Cinema* (1st ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Elsaesser, T. (2002). *Studying contemporary American film : a guide to movie analysis* (1. publ.). London [u.a.]: Arnold.

Landow, G. P. (2006). *Hypertext 3.0: Critical Theory and New Media in an Era of Globalization* (3rd ed.). The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Manovitch, L. (2001). *The language of new media*. Cambridge (Mass.) ;;London: the MIT press.

Miles, A. (1999). Cinematic Paradigms for Hypertext. *Continuum Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, *13*(2), 217–26.

Ndalianis, A. (2000). The Frenzy of the Visible: Spectacle and Motion in the Era of the Digital. *Senses of Cinema*, (3).

Omon, Ž., Bergala, A., Mari, M., & Verne, M. (2006). *Estetika filma*. Beograd: Clio.

Quart, A. (2005, August 1). Networked: Don Roos and "Happy Endings." *Alissa Quart*.

Ryan, M.-L. (2001). Beyond Myth and Metaphor: The Case of Narrative in Digital Media. *Game Studies*. Retrieved April 16, 2010, from http://gamestudies.org/0101/ryan/